TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF	Docket No. 030048124US

In re Application of: Michael B. McAvoy

Application No.	Filing Date	Examiner	Group Art Unit
10/731,695-Conf. #3269	December 9, 2003	R. M. Mancho	3663

Invention: AIRCRAFT GALLEY SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR MANAGING ELECTRIC POWER FOR AIRCRAFT GALLEY SYSTEMS

TO THE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS:

Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application, with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed: April 26, 2007 .

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is $ 500.00 .

[x] Large Entity [ ] Small Entity

[ ] A petition for extension of time is also enclosed.

The fee for the extension of time is _____ .

[x] The amount of $ 500.00 is being paid via EFT Account.

[ ] Charge the amount of the fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0665 .
This sheet is submitted in duplicate.

[ ] Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.

[x] The Director is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0665 .

Dated: June 20, 2007

Stephen E. Arnett
Attorney Reg. No. : 47,392
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000

Docket No.: 030048124US
Client Ref No. 03-1107

(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Michael B. McAvoy

Application No.: 10/731,695 Confirmation No.: 3269

Filed: December 9, 2003 Art Unit: 3663

For: AIRCRAFT GALLEY SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR MANAGING ELECTRIC POWER FOR AIRCRAFT GALLEY SYSTEMS

Examiner: R. M. Mancho

APPEAL BRIEF

MS Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

As required under § 41.37(a), this brief is filed within two months of the Notice of Appeal filed in this case on April 26, 2007, and is in furtherance of said Notice of Appeal.

The fees required under § 41.20(b)(2) are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF.

This brief contains items under the following headings as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 and M.P.E.P. § 1205.2:

I. Real Party In Interest
II Related Appeals and Interferences
III. Status of Claims

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal is:

The Boeing Company

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal. See Appendix C.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

A. Total Number of Claims in Application

There are 20 claims pending in the application.

B. Current Status of Claims

1. Claims canceled: None
2. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: 8-10 and 13
3. Claims pending: 1-13 and 71-77
4. Claims currently under consideration: 1-7, 11, 12 and 71-77
5. Claims allowed: None
6. Claims rejected: 1-7, 11, 12 and 71-77

C. Claims On Appeal

Claims 1-7, 11, 12 and 71-77 are on appeal.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Applicant did not file an Amendment After Final Rejection.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The claimed subject matter is directed generally toward methods and systems for controlling aircraft galley equipment and managing electric power for such equipment.

Commercial transport aircraft typically include service galleys for preparing meals and refreshments for passengers and crew. A typical service galley includes a number of electrical appliances or "inserts" such as ovens, coffee makers, trash compactors, and air chillers. Each of the appliances is independently connected to a power feeder that receives electrical power from an aircraft power source. Although most galley appliances operate in a cyclic nature, or for only short periods of time, the electrical power feeder must be sized to support a worst-case load event in which all of the appliances are operating at the same time. Sizing the power feeder for this worst-case scenario results in a relatively heavy and relatively expensive power feeder.

Conventional transport aircraft typically allocate a preset amount of electrical power for galley operations. A typical passenger jet, for example, may allocate between 90 and 100 KVA (Kilovolt-Amperes) for such operations. If a particular airline customer selects a suite of galley equipment that could potentially exceed the allocation of electrical power, then interlocks are incorporated into the galley power circuit to prevent an overload. Interlocks are switches that allow flight attendants to make power available to one appliance or one group of appliances, but not another appliance or another group of appliances. In this way, power is available for only a subset of the galley appliances at any given time, thereby preventing the possibility of exceeding the power allocation.

One downside of interlocks, however, is that they can increase aircraft customization and complexity. Furthermore, the flight attendants may have to manually coordinate galley appliance usage, which can increase flight attendant workload and detract from providing other in-flight services in an efficient manner.

Electric power to galley systems on a conventional jet aircraft is typically cut off when the aircraft experience a significant power shortage. This event is referred to as a "load shed." When power is restored, the galley appliances may or may not, depending on the specific type of appliance, resume operation. One downside associated with load sheds is that flight attendants must guess at how to reset oven timers and other appliance settings to complete food preparation once power has been restored. (Specification; Background; page 1, line 4 – page 2, line 16).

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for distributing electric power to a plurality of electrical devices in a vehicle. (See, generally, Specification, page 15, line 1 – page 16, line 26). In this regard, Figure 6 of the present application illustrates "a routine 600 for managing the distribution of power to galley appliances in accordance with an embodiment of the invention." (See, e.g., page 21, lines 14-15). The routine can be implemented by a controller 240 which is operably connected to each of the appliances. (See, e.g., Figures 2 and 5, and related text on page 8, lines 14-21; and page 21, lines 14-

18). The method of claim 1 includes "receiving at least a first operating command for at least one of the plurality of electrical devices." As discussed on page 21 of the Specification at lines 21-24, the routine implemented by the controller 240 can include receiving a first operating command for at least one of the plurality of electrical devices from a flight attendant or other user when he or she inputs an operating command to one or more of the galley appliances or otherwise turns the appliance "On."

In response to receiving the operating command, the method of claim 1 further includes "polling the plurality of electrical devices for power requests," and "receiving at least one power request from the plurality of electrical devices in response to the poll." (See, e.g., page 24 at lines 23-26: "...the controller 240 issues a poll command to the appliances, and the appliances respond by generating power requests that are transmitted back to the controller.") Furthermore, as explained on, for example, page 21 at lines 24-28, the controller 240 "polls the appliances for power requests," and the controller 240 "receives power requests from the appliances in response to the poll." Each power request can include a quantitative portion or "load," and a qualitative portion or "request level." (See, e.g., page 21, lines 25-27; and page 24 at lines 7-11). The method of independent claim 1 further includes "distributing power to the electrical devices based on the at least one power request received from the plurality of electrical devices." (See, e.g., page 21, line 28 – page 23, line 16).

Independent claim 71 is directed to a method for distributing electric power to a plurality of electrical devices in a vehicle. The plurality of electrical devices includes at least first and second electrical devices operably connected to a controller. (See, e.g., the controller 240 and the electrical devices 520a-528 of Figure 5; the routine of Figure 6; and related text at page 13, line 27 – page 21, line 20). The method of claim 71 includes receiving "at least one operating command for at least one of the plurality of electrical devices" at the controller. (See, e.g., Figure 6 and related text at page 21, lines 21-24). In response to receiving the operating command, the method further includes "sending a poll from the controller to the plurality of electrical devices for power requests," and "receiving a

first prior request from the first electrical device when the first electrical device responds to the poll." The method of claim 71 additionally includes "receiving a second power request from the second electrical device when the second electrical device responds to the poll," and then "distributing power to the first and second electrical devices based on the first and second power requests." (See, e.g., Figure 6 and related text at page 21, line 5 – page 23, line 16).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

(A) Whether claims 71-77 fail to comply with the enablement requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph;

(B) Whether claims 2-7 are indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; and

(C) Whether U.S. Patent No. 5,936,318 to Weiler et al. ("Weiler") anticipates claims 1-7, 11, 12 and 71-77 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

VII. ARGUMENT

A. Claims 71-77 Are Fully Enabled as Required by 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

In the final Office Action mailed January 30, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 71-77 for failing to comply with the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. More specifically, the Examiner asserted that the limitation in independent claim 71 of "sending a poll from the controller to the plurality of electrical device[s]" was not enabled in the disclosure. Furthermore, the Examiner maintained that "the applicant does not provide the meaning of a "poll" or the reason for sending a "poll" as disclosed in the invention. (Office Action at page 2, paragraphs 4 and 5).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the assertion that the limitation of "sending a poll from the controller to the plurality of electrical devices" is not enabled in the

disclosure, or that the applicant does not provide the meaning of a "poll" or the reason for sending a "poll." To the contrary, as described in more detail below, the disclosure is replete with enabling description of this subject matter.

For example, Figure 5 of the disclosure presents a schematic diagram of a galley system 500 configured in accordance with an embodiment of the invention. As the related text on page 13, line 27 – page 21, line 13 explains, the galley system 500 includes a controller 240 that receives operating power from the circuit breaker panel 242. "[T]he controller 240. . . is operably coupled to each of the galley appliances" in "a network system ... that networks the appliances and other electrical items to the controller 240...." (Specification; page 14, line 3; and page 21, lines 4-6). "The controller 240 can include a controller processor 544 for executing computer-readable instructions stored in a memory 545." (Specification; page 14, lines 22-26).

Furthermore, with regard to the Examiner's contention that "sending a poll from the controller to the plurality of electrical devices" is not enabled by the disclosure, the disclosure explicitly states, "the controller 240 issues a poll command to the appliances, and the appliances respond by generating power requests that are transmitted back to the controller 240." (Specification; page 24, lines 23-26; and see Figure 6 and related text on page 21, line 25, "in block 602, the routine 600 polls the appliances for power request.")

Section 2164.01(b) of the M.P.E.P. clearly states, "as long as the specification discloses at least one method for making and using the claimed invention that bears a reasonable correlation to the entire scope of the claim, then the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is satisfied. *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 U.S.P.Q. 18, 24 (C.C.P.A. 1970). Furthermore, a patent need not teach, and preferably omits, what is well known in the art. (M.P.E.P. §2164.01). As the foregoing discussion clearly shows, the specification does indeed disclose at least one method for operably coupling a controller to a plurality of electrical devices and "sending a poll from the controller to the plurality of

electrical device[s]." Accordingly, independent claim 71 meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner further suggests that the applicant does not provide the meaning of a "poll" or the reason for sending a "poll" as disclosed in the invention. Again, the Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, on page 21 at line 25, the Specification states:

> "In block 602, the routine 600 polls the appliances for a power request. As discussed above, each power request can include a quantitative portion or "load," and a qualitative portion of "request level." In block 604, the routine 600 receives power requests from the appliances in response to the poll."

Furthermore, on page 24 at lines 23-26, the Specification states:

> "[I]n the embodiment described above with Figures 6 and 7, the controller issues a poll command to the appliances, and the appliances respond by generating power requests that are transmitted back to the controller 240."

As this and other portions of the specification make abundantly clear, the meaning of "poll" can include a survey of the appliances to acquire information, such as to acquire power requests from the appliances. This is reinforced by the statement in the specification that "the routine 600 receives power request from the appliances in response to the poll." Indeed, this definition of "poll" is entirely consistent with the common usage of the term. (See, for example, *The American Heritage College Dictionary*, 3rd ed., "poll (pōl) *n.* . . . iv. a survey of the public or of a sample of public opinion to acquire information. – *the. polled, poll.ing, polls. – tr. . . . 4. to question in a survey; canvas.*")

Thus, as is clear from the specification, the meaning of "poll" is to survey the appliances for a power request, and the reason for sending the poll is to obtain the power request from the appliances. Therefore, claim 71 fully complies with the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 72, the Examiner asserts that the limitation, "sorting of the first and second power request" as disclosed in the invention is not enabled. (Office Action at page 3; lines 1-2). The Examiner goes on to state that "the applicant does not provide in what manner or how "sorting" is done in the claimed "sorting of the first and second power request." The Applicant respectfully disagrees; the Specification does indeed describe at least one embodiment of "sorting."

For example, on page 15 at line 15, the disclosure states, "upon receiving the power request from the respective appliances, the controller 240 can compare and sort the request in descending order based on the request level." A full description of different request levels is provided in Table 1 on page 17 of the disclosure, and is described in detail in the associated text. Furthermore, on page 21 at line 28, the specification states, "In block 606, the routine 600 sorts the power request in descending order based on the request level (e.g., level 7-0). In one embodiment, the routine 600 can compare the power request to each other first to ascertain the respective request levels before sorting them according to request level." Furthermore, in Figure 6 at block 606, the routine 600 "sorts list of power request in descending order of request levels."

Thus, the assertion that sorting is not enabled, or that the applicant does not provide in what manner or how "sorting" is done, is unfounded in view of the explicit description of this subject matter in the specification. Therefore, the Section 112 rejections of independent claim 71, and corresponding dependent claims 72-77, should be withdrawn.

B. Claims 2-7 are not indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 2-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With regard to claim 2, the Examiner stated that it was unclear what was meant and encompassed by a "qualitative component" and a "quantitative component" as used in the application. More specifically, the Examiner

asserted that the "applicant does not provide a meaning of 'request level' in the disclosure. Thus 'request level' is indefinite." (Office Action at page 3; paragraph 7).

A review of the disclosure shows that, contrary to these assertions, the disclosure clearly describes what is meant and encompassed by "qualitative component," "quantitative component," and "request level." For example, on page 15 at line 9, the Specification clearly states.

> "[I]n one embodiment described in greater detail below, the power request can have two components. The first component is a quantitative component corresponding to the amount of power or "load" the appliance currently requires to comply with the operating command from the flight attendant. The second component is a qualitative component corresponding to the level or the "request level" at which the appliance currently needs the power to comply with the operative command."

Furthermore, on page 16 at line 27, the specification states:

> "[I]n one embodiment each of the galley appliances can be configured to transmit power requests as needed for operation to the controller 240. The power request can have two components: a load and a request level. Table 1 below illustrates a scheme for power request levels in accordance with one embodiment of the invention."

As the following text explains, each if the different request levels represents the level of need for power of the particular appliance. Furthermore, Table 1 and the associated text starting on page 17 provide detailed descriptions of various request levels in accordance with an embodiment of the invention.

As these portions of the Specification clearly explain, the "quantitative component" corresponds to the amount of power an appliance requires, and the "qualitative component" corresponds to the level of need, or the "request level" at which the appliance

currently needs the power to comply with an operating command. Thus, claim 2 is not indefinite, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 4 states that the first power request from the first appliance includes a first need component, and the second power request from the second appliance includes a second need component. With regard to claim 4, the Examiner asserted that the "first need component" and "second need component" are not clear. (Office Action at page 3; paragraph 7). To the contrary, however, the text on page 15 of the Specification clearly states that the power request can have a "qualitative component" corresponding "to the 'request level' at which the appliance currently needs the power to comply with the operating command." (Underlining added). Thus, the "need components" are qualitative components corresponding to the level at which the appliances currently need power to comply with the various operating commands. Accordingly, the specification provides ample description of the subject matter of claim 4. Therefore, claim 4 is not indefinite and this rejection should be withdrawn.

C. Weiler Does Not Anticipate Claims 1-7, 11, 12 and 71-77 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-7, 11, 12 and 71-77 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Weiler.

The standard for anticipation under Section 102(b) requires that a single prior art reference describe each and every element as set forth in the claim. (M.P.E.P. § 2131). As explained in greater detail below, Weiler cannot support a Section 102 rejection of claims 1-8 and 11-13 for at least the reason that this reference fails to disclose or suggest each and every element as set forth in the claims.

1. Claim 1 is Directed to a Method for Distributing Electric Power that Includes, *Inter Alia*, Polling a Plurality of Electrical Devices for Power Requests, and Receiving At Least One Power Request From the Plurality of Electrical Devices in Response to the Poll

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for distributing electric power to a plurality of electrical devices in a vehicle. The method includes, *inter alia*, receiving at least a first operating command for at least one of the plurality of electrical devices, and polling the plurality of electrical devices for power requests in response to receiving the operating command. The method further includes receiving at least one power request from the plurality of electrical devices in response to the poll, and distributing power to the electrical devices based on the at least one power request received from the plurality of electrical devices.

2. Weiler is Directed to a Power System that Distributes Electrical Power Based On the Status of One or More Power Sources and/or the Load in Corresponding Power Line Strands

As Figure 1 of Weiler shows, a plurality of power consuming devices 14-18, 19-22, and 23-26 receive power from sources 80A-80C via power supply strands 1a-1n and corresponding branch line strands 5a-5n, 6a-6n, and 7a-7n, respectively. The electrical power from the branch line strands 5a-5n, 6a-6n, and 7a-7n is distributed to the power consuming devices 14-18, 19-22, and 23-26 via corresponding power allocation units 11, 12, and 13, respectively. A central power control unit 27 is operably connected to each of the power allocation units 11, 12 and 13.

Figure 2 of Weiler illustrates the power control unit 27 and the power allocation unit 11 in more detail. As Weiler states, the individual branch line conductors 5a-5n (shown as "5" in Figure 2) pass through the load sensor 43 and provide electric power to the power switch 42. The load sensor 43 senses the respective load condition on each one of the branch lines 5a-5n, and provides corresponding output signals via line 53 to the load monitor 40 and via line 54 to the allocation control unit 41. (Weiler in column 4 at lines 56-63).

In operation, Weiler allocates power to the power consuming devices based on the status of the power sources and/or the measured load in the power supply strands. More specifically, the power control unit 27 monitors the loads the branch lines 5a-5n and balances the loads if one exceeds an acceptable range. For example, as Weiler states in column 5 at line 66 to column 6 line 18:

> "During operation of the system, the currently present actual load prevailing in each strand 5a-5n of the branch line 5 is measured by the load sensor 43, and the corresponding measured values are conveyed to the load monitor 40 as well as the allocation control unit 41. . . . The allocation control unit compares the load values received from the receiver stage 39 with the load values received from the load sensor 43, and then takes the comparison result into consideration when generating the switching commands for the power switch 42. If the load values measured by the load sensor 43 are within the respectively acceptable range, then the allocations provided by the standard matrix 35 are released for realization in the power switch 42. However, if any particular load value measured by the load sensor 43 exceeds the acceptable load limit, then the power switch 42 will disconnect a respective power consuming device (i.e., the power consuming devices 14-18) from the overloaded power line strand, and instead connect it to a different power line strand . . . ." (Words in parentheses added).

Weiler also discloses a method for reacting to a failure of one or more of the power sources 80A-80C shown in Figure 1. For example, as Weiler states in column 6 at lines 22-34:

> "The present apparatus is capable of logically reacting to any malfunction or failure of one or more of the power supply circuits, and thereby largely avoid device failures resulting from a power failure. For example, if the signals provided by the status unit 44 contain information indicating that one power

supply circuit has failed due to failure of the respective power source (i.e., the power sources 80A-80C) or the power line strand, then the selection processor 36 (Figure 2) will determine and generate signals for a new allocation in such a manner that all power consuming devices affected by the power failure will be reallocated and reconnected to the remaining operative power supply circuits . . . ." (Words in parentheses added).

As the foregoing makes clear, Weiler allocates power sources and/or power supply strands based on the status of the power supply sources and/or the measured load in the power supply strands.

3. Weiler Does Not Disclose or Suggest, *Inter Alia*, Polling a Plurality of Electrical Devices for Power Requests, and Receiving At Least One Power Request From the Plurality of Electrical Devices in Response to the Poll

A proper rejection of claim 1 under Section 102(b) would require, *inter alia*, that Weiler disclose: polling a plurality of electrical devices for power requests in response to receiving an operating command from at least one of the electrical devices. Weiler, however, does not disclose or even suggest this feature. In fact, Weiler fails to disclose or suggest *any* type of electrical device polling – much less polling the electrical devices in response to an operating command from one of the electrical devices.

Indeed, as the text and figures of Weiler make clear, the power control unit 27 does not exchange any information directly with any of the power consuming devices (e.g., the power consuming devices 14-18 shown in Figure 2). As Figure 2 of Weiler clearly illustrates, the only devices directly connected to the power consuming devices 14-18 are the power switches 42. The power switches 42, however, do not exchange information with the power consuming devices 14-18. To the contrary, the power switches 42 provide electrical power to the power consuming devices 14-18 via feeder lines 14' – 26'. (*See, e.g.*, Weiler in column 4 at lines 6-12: ". . . the power switches 42 ... each form a selective

interconnection switching junction or means for selectively interconnecting the feeder lines 14' – 26' on the one hand, and the branch line strands 5n-5n . . . on the other hand.")

Furthermore, the only device of the power allocation unit 11 that sends information to the power control unit 27 is the load monitor 40, which processes the load in the individual power strands 5n-5n as communicated by the load sensor 43, and then sends these measured values to the load reply signal unit 38 of the power control unit 27. (*See, e.g.*, Weiler in column 6 at lines 4-6).

Because the power control unit 27 of Weiler does not communicate with the power consuming devices 14-18, the power control unit 27 of Weiler cannot reasonably be construed as "polling the plurality of electrical devices for power requests," as the Examiner suggests. Accordingly, Weiler cannot support a Section 102 rejection of claim 1 for at least this reason, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Weiler cannot support a Section 102 rejection of independent claim 1 for at least one additional reason. The method of claim 1 includes receiving at least one power request from the plurality of electrical devices in response to the poll. Nowhere does Weiler disclose or suggest that any of the power consuming devices provide a power request in response to a poll. Indeed, the power consuming devices 14-18 of Weiler cannot even respond "to a poll" because the only disclosed connection to an external device is a power connection (i.e., the feeder lines 14'- 18' shown in Figure 2). Therefore, it is unreasonable to suggest that Weiler somehow discloses or suggests electrical devices that provide power requests in response to a poll. Absent this feature, Weiler cannot support a Section 102 rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn for at least this additional reason.

Claims 2-8 and 11-13 depend from base claim 1. Accordingly, Weiler cannot support a Section 102 rejection of dependent claims 2-8 and 11-13 for at least the reason that this reference cannot support a Section 102 rejection of corresponding base claim 1,

and for the additional features of these dependent claims. Therefore, the rejection of dependent claims 2-8 and 11-13 should be withdrawn.

The rejections of dependent claims 2 and 3 should be withdrawn for at least one additional reason. These claims are directed to the method of claim 1, and further state, *inter alia*, that receiving the at least one power request includes receiving a power request having a "quantitative component" and a "qualitative component." As discussed above with regard to the Section 102 rejection of claim 1, Weiler does not disclose receiving any power request from an electrical device – much less a power request "having a quantitative component and a qualitative component." Nevertheless, the Examiner attempts to overcome this deficiency by simply identifying a portion of the Weiler text and making the unsupported assertion that "the priority and consumption loads are different." (Office Action on page 5). Regardless of whether Weiler discloses a "priority load" and a "consumption load," and regardless of whether the priority load is "different" than the consumption load, this still does not mean that the "priority load" corresponds to "a quantitative component" and the "consumption load" corresponds to "a qualitative component" – or vice verse for that matter. Accordingly, the Section 102 rejections of dependent claims 2 and 3 should be withdrawn for at least this additional reason.

Dependent claims 4-8 and 11-13 include additional features not disclosed or suggested by Weiler. For example, dependent claim 4 is directed to the method of claim 1 and further states, *inter alia*, that receiving the at least one power request includes receiving a first power request from a first appliance and a second power request from a second appliance. In addition, claim 4 states that the first power request includes at least a first need component and the second power request includes a second need component. Claim 4 goes on to state that distributing power to the electrical devices includes distributing power to the first and second appliances based on a comparison of the first need component to the second need component.

Nowhere does Weiler disclose or suggest receiving power requests with need components from electrical appliances, or distributing power to the electrical appliances based on a comparison of the need components. Accordingly, Weiler cannot support a Section 102 rejection of dependent claim 4 for at least this additional reason, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

D. Conclusion

The Examiner rejected claims 2-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and claims 71-77 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The applicant has shown, however, that these claims are fully enabled and not indefinite. Therefore, the Board should reverse the rejections of claims 2-7 and 71-77 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 11, 12 and 71-77 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Weiler. As explained in detail above, however, Weiler fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claims 1-7, 11, 12 and 71-77. Accordingly, Weiler cannot support a Section 102 rejection of the pending claims for at least this reason. Therefore, the Board should reverse these rejections.

VIII. CLAIMS

A copy of the claims involved in the present appeal is attached hereto as Appendix A.

The $500 filing fee is being paid via EFT Account. If additional fees are due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 030048124US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: June 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Stephen E. Arnett
Registration No.: 47,392
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

APPENDIX A

Claims Involved in the Appeal of Application Serial No. 10/731,695

1. (Original) A method for distributing electric power to a plurality of electrical devices in a vehicle, the method comprising:

receiving at least a first operating command for at least one of the plurality of electrical devices;

in response to receiving the operating command, polling the plurality of electrical devices for power requests;

receiving at least one power request from the plurality of electrical devices in response to the poll; and

distributing power to the electrical devices based on the at least one power request received from the plurality of electrical devices.

2. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1 wherein receiving the at least one power request includes receiving a power request having a quantitative component and a qualitative component, and wherein the qualitative component is different than the quantitative component.

3. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1 wherein receiving the at least one power request includes receiving a power request having a quantitative load component and a qualitative need component, and wherein the qualitative need component is different than the quantitative load component.

4. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1 wherein receiving the at least one power request includes receiving a first power request from a first appliance and a second power request from a second appliance, wherein the first power request includes a

first need component and the second power request includes a second need component, and wherein distributing power to the electrical devices includes distributing power to the first and second appliances based on a comparison of the first need component to the second need component.

5. (Original) The method of claim 1 wherein the plurality of electrical devices includes at least first and second aircraft galley appliances, wherein receiving the at least one power request includes receiving a first power request from the first galley appliance and a second power request from the second galley appliance, wherein the method further comprises sorting the first and second power requests in descending order of need, and wherein distributing power to the plurality of electrical devices includes distributing power to the first and second galley appliances based on the sorting of the first and second power requests.

6. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising receiving a preset allocation of electric power for distribution to the plurality of electrical devices, and wherein distributing power to the electrical devices includes distributing a total amount of power that does not exceed the preset allocation.

7. (Original) The method of claim 1 wherein receiving at least a first operating command for at least one of the plurality of electrical devices includes receiving an operating command from a user via a display screen operably coupled to the at least one electrical device.

8. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 1 wherein receiving at least a first operating command for at least one of the plurality of electrical devices includes receiving an operating command from a user via a display screen operably coupled to the at least one electrical device and positioned remote from the at least one electrical device.

9. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 1 wherein receiving at least a first operating command for at least one of the plurality of electrical devices includes receiving an operating command from a user via at least one touch-key on a display screen operably coupled to the at least one electrical device and positioned remote from the at least one electrical device.

10. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 1 wherein receiving at least a first operating command for at least one of the plurality of electrical devices includes receiving an operating command from a user via a wireless device.

11. (Original) The method of claim 1 wherein receiving at least a first operating command includes receiving first and second operating commands, the first operating command corresponding to a first galley appliance on an aircraft and the second operating command corresponding to a second galley appliance on the aircraft.

12. (Original) The method of claim 1 wherein receiving at least a first operating command includes receiving an operating command from a user.

13. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 1 wherein receiving at least a first operating command includes receiving an automatically generated operating command from a vehicle system.

14-70. (Cancelled)

71. (Previously Presented) A method for distributing electric power to a plurality of electrical devices in a vehicle, wherein the plurality of electrical devices includes at least first and second electrical devices operably connected to a controller, the method comprising:

receiving, at the controller, at least one operating command for at least one of the plurality of electrical devices;

in response to receiving the operating command, sending a poll from the controller to the plurality of electrical devices for power requests;

receiving, at the controller, a first power request from the first electrical device when the first electrical device responds to the poll;

receiving, at the controller, a second power request from the second electrical device when the second electrical device responds to the poll; and

distributing power to the first and second electrical devices based on the first and second power requests.

72. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 71, further comprising sorting the first and second power requests, wherein distributing power to the first and second electrical devices includes distributing power to the first and second electrical devices based on the sorting of the first and second power requests.

73. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 71 wherein receiving, at the controller, a first power request from the first electrical device includes receiving a first power request associated with a first request level, wherein receiving, at the controller, a second power request from the second electrical device includes receiving a second power request associated with a second request level, wherein the method further comprises sorting the first and second power requests based on request level, and wherein distributing power to the first and second electrical devices includes distributing power to

the first and second electrical devices based on the sorting of the first and second power requests.

74. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 71 wherein receiving, at the controller, a first power request from the first electrical device includes receiving a first power request associated with a first level of need, wherein receiving, at the controller, a second power request from the second electrical device includes receiving a second power request associated with a second level of need, wherein the method further comprises sorting the first and second power requests based on level of need, and wherein distributing power to the first and second electrical devices includes distributing power to the first and second electrical devices based on the sorting of the first and second power requests.

75. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 71 wherein receiving, at the controller, a first power request from the first electrical device includes receiving a power request having a quantitative component and a qualitative component, and wherein the qualitative component is different than the quantitative component.

76. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 71 wherein receiving, at the controller, a first power request from the first electrical device includes receiving a power request having a quantitative load component and a qualitative need component, and wherein the qualitative need component is different than the quantitative load component.

77. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 71 wherein receiving, at the controller, at least one operating command for at least one of the plurality of electrical devices includes receiving a user operating command from the at least one electrical device.

APPENDIX B

No evidence pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by or relied upon by the examiner is being submitted.

APPENDIX C

No related proceedings are referenced in II. above, hence copies of decisions in related proceedings are not provided.